

IN THE DRAWINGS:

Please amend Figure 1 as shown on the replacement drawing sheets attached to the Submission of Corrected Drawings submitted herewith.

In Figure 1, textual labels have been added.

REMARKS

Claims 1, 3-6, 8-11, 13-16, and 18-20 are pending in the application. In the non-final Office Action mailed April 4, 2005, the Examiner made the following disposition:

- A.) **Objected to Figure 1.**
- B.) **Rejected claims 1, 3-6, 8-11, 13-16, and 18-20 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over *Neeman, et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,588,147)* in view of *Multer, et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,694,336)*.**

Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection and address the Examiner's disposition below.

A.) Objection to Figure 1:

Figure 1 has been amended as per the Examiner's request to overcome the objection. A replacement sheet for Figure 1 is submitted with the Submission of Corrected Drawings filed herewith.

The specification has been amended to reflect the amendment to Figure 1. Specifically, Figure 1 has been amended to include labels for the already-present unlabelled nodes. The specification has been amended to describe the unlabelled nodes. No new matter is added by this amendment.

Applicants respectfully submit the objection has been overcome and request that it be withdrawn.

B.) Rejection of claims 1, 3-6, 8-11, 13-16, and 18-20 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over *Neeman, et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,588,147)* in view of *Multer, et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,694,336)*:

Applicants respectfully disagree with the rejection.

Independent claims 1, 6, 11, and 16, each as amended, each claim subject matter relating to reconciling changes made to a first file tree and a second file tree, wherein it is determined whether reconciling the first and said second file trees creates an unresolvable loop in at least one of the first and the second file trees. In an illustrative example, when reconciling the first and second file trees, two items in a file tree may become each other's ancestors, which may result in

an unresolvable loop. The claimed invention determines whether the reconciliation creates an unresolvable loop.

This is clearly unlike *Neeman* in view of *Multer*, which fails to disclose or suggest determining whether reconciling a first file tree and a second file tree creates an unresolvable loop. *Neeman* discusses namespace reconciliation, including creating, deleting, moving, and renaming objects during reconciliation. (*Neeman* 8:14-18). However, nowhere does *Neeman* teach determining whether reconciling a first file tree and a second file tree creates an unresolvable loop. In fact, *Neeman* fails to mention unresolvable loops.

Multer also fails to disclose or suggest determining whether reconciling a first file tree and a second file tree creates an unresolvable loop. Nowhere does *Multer* mention unresolvable loops.

Therefore, *Neeman* in view of *Multer* fails to disclose or suggest claims 1, 6, 11, and 16.

Claims 3-5, 8-10, 13-15, and 18-20 depend directly or indirectly from claims 1, 6, 11, or 16 and are therefore allowable for at least the same reasons that claims 1, 6, 11, and 16 are allowable.

Applicants respectfully submit the rejection has been overcome and request that it be withdrawn.

VI. Conclusion

In view of the foregoing comments, Applicants respectfully submit that the present amendment places the above-referenced application in condition for allowance, and thus, a swift allowance is respectfully requested so that the application may swiftly pass to issue.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: August 30, 2005


Christopher P. Rauch
Registration No. 45,034

Customer No.: 26263
Sonnenschein Nath & Rosenthal LLP
P.O. Box 061080
Wacker Drive Station
Chicago, Illinois 60606-1080
Telephone: 202/408-9214
Facsimile: 312/876-7934